

#4

P A T E N T

Attorney Docket :  
33240 M 011

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**



Applicant : Youichiro NISHIKAWA  
Serial No. : 09/748,389 Art Unit : 2614  
Filed : December 27, 2000 Examiner : Not Yet Assigned  
For : Television Receiver, Remote Controller for Television Receiver, and  
Service Providing System

RECEIVED  
APR 09 2001  
Technology Center 2600

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OF REQUIREMENT FOR SUBSTITUTE DRAWINGS**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir :

This is in reply to the Notice To File Corrected Application Papers dated  
February 8, 2001. A reply to the Notice is due by April 8, 2001.

Reconsideration of the requirement for substitute drawings courteously is  
solicited.

At first impression, it does appear that some drawings include excessive text.  
However, upon closer inspection, the drawings should not be viewed as including an  
excessive amount of text. Figure 1 is a typical block diagram. For the moment, we will  
skip over Figures 2 and 3. Figure 4 is a typical flow chart, wherein the textual  
information is contained within the flow chart box steps. Figures 5-8 depict screen  
displays and, accordingly, include both pictorial and textual information generated as a  
result of carrying out the Applicant's invention. No changes are considered necessary  
for these standard-type drawings, Figures 1 and 4-8.

Figures 9-11 are described as "sequence" diagrams. These are less frequently used than flow charts but are similar to flow charts. Figures 9-11 include textual information descriptive of data sent between major elements in the Applicant's disclosed system. Line segments with arrows are provided to indicate the direction of data flow between such major elements. This is typical for such diagrams and very helpful to a reader in summarizing the directionality and chronology of data flow between major elements, as the reader progresses through the text of the specification. Hence, Applicant urges that no changes should be made to Figures 9-11.

Figures 2 and 3 now are considered. These Figures present examples of the format of information utilized by the Applicant's system. These Figures should be viewed as presenting an abbreviated listing exemplary of high-level coding for carrying out the present invention. They present much better as a drawing, using the length of the paper to spread out the coding. Otherwise, this information, if presented on a specification page, would be squeezed together across the relatively shorter width-direction of the page. Moreover, because there are only two sheets of drawings presenting this high-level coding information (Figures 2 and 3), there is no reason for providing a separate appendix-like section in the specification to present this material. It is better suited for presentation in the drawings, as it currently appears. For these reasons, it courteously is urged that Figures 2 and 3 also be accepted without modification.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration of the requirement for substitute drawings courteously is solicited. Withdrawal of the requirement is requested so that the application can move on within the normal course of examination. If a patent examiner takes a different view than what is expressed herein, then the undersigned would be happy to work out the details of any modifications to the drawings with such examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 

Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263  
1850 M Street, NW - Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 659-2811  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

April 6, 2001